Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

MECEIVED
on $\frac{\partial CI}{\partial t} = 7$ to
DEPAR COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION 6 PROE OF SECRETARY
MOVET EUE CODY CO.

Dr-

In the Matter of)

CC Docket No. 95-116

Telephone Number Portability

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

REPLY OF TELEPORT COMMUNICATIONS GROUP INC. TO RESPONSES TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION

Teleport Communications Group Inc. ("TCG") hereby files this reply to the various responses to petitions for reconsideration and clarification of the First Report and Order ("Number Portability Order"), FCC 96-286, released July 2, 1996, in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 27, 1996, the Association of Local Telecommunications

Services ("ALTS"), of which TCG is a member, filed a Response to the Petitions for

Reconsideration and Clarification of the Commission's Number Portability Order

("ALTS response"). Though TCG agrees with the bulk of the ALTS response,

TCG disagrees with ALTS on the single issue of whether two carriers should be

permitted to agree to use Query on Release ("QoR") between their networks. TCG

files these comments to clarify its position on QoR.

LE JASCOE

^{1.} Response of the Association for Local Telecommunications Services to Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification, In re Telephone Number Portability, CC Docket No. 95-116 (September 27, 1996).

II. QOR CAN SAVE PRECIOUS FUNDS FOR SOME ENTRANTS DURING INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF NUMBER PORTABILITY

QoR is a database dip suppression functionality for the provision of number portability that relieves carriers from performing database dips on calls that are completed to the switch for which a dialed number was originally assigned. During initial implementation of number portability, few numbers will be ported from each NXX code.² Initially, most calls will be terminated to the original switch. However, once a *single* number has been ported from a particular NXX code, *all* calls terminating to a number with that NXX code must be dipped.

TCG expects that many, if not most, NXX codes in areas with permanent number portability will have at least one number ported soon after implementation. However, it may take significantly longer for a substantial amount of numbers to be ported from most NXX codes. This will have a substantial effect on implementation costs for incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") as well as many competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs"). Facilities-based CLECs will need to purchase additional service control point database pairs ("SCPs") as capacity on their original SCPs is exhausted. Capacity on the SCPs will be filled much more quickly if all calls to portable NXXs must be dipped. Additionally, CLECs that opt to perform database dips through a third party will be required to pay for a much larger number of dips.

^{2.} An "NXX" refers to the first three digits in a seven-digit local telephone number. An NXX code contains a potential 10,000 local telephone numbers.

Since QoR can lower costs associated with the initial phase of permanent number portability, TCG would like to retain the option of using QoR. However, TCG maintains that the FCC should not require QoR of any carrier, as discussed further below. As more numbers are ported from existing NXX codes, fewer "unnecessary" dips will be performed. When the cost savings of prevented dips no longer outweigh the costs in using QoR, TCG feels that parties should then be free to terminate the use of QoR.

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ALLOW QOR AS LONG AS SUCH USE IS VOLUNTARY

TCG fully supports the ALTS position that CLECs should not be forced by an ILEC to use QoR. TCG acknowledges that QoR adds dialing delay to calls terminating to customers who have switched local service providers and have had their numbers ported in the process. Therefore, TCG believes that QoR should only be allowed at the discretion of the relevant CLEC after having an opportunity to weigh potential cost savings against the drawbacks of QoR. If two carriers agree mutually that QoR may be used between their respective networks, then TCG believes that QoR should be allowed.

IV. QoR SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF LRN

ALTS asserts that once an ILEC has a sufficient number of agreements that allow voluntary QoR, then the ILECs could successfully seek a delay or even a cancellation of Location Routing Number ("LRN") implementation based on the

apparent acceptance of the QoR process.³ TCG fully agrees that implementation of LRN should not be delayed, and sees no reason why QoR should cause such a delay.

QoR is a database dip suppression functionality that requires LRN.

Therefore, QoR may be added after initial implementation of LRN. While TCG believes that QoR can produce valuable cost savings to carriers such as TCG, TCG does not see any reason to delay LRN. In its Number Portability Order, the Commission issued a strict implementation schedule for the introduction of number portability. TCG fully agrees with ALTS that QoR should not be used as an excuse to delay the introduction of number portability through the LRN method consistent with the FCC's schedule.

V. CONCLUSION

QoR can reduce implementation costs of permanent number portability for ILECs and CLECs alike. TCG endorses voluntary use of QoR. However, even voluntary

^{3.} ALTS response at 2-3.

^{4.} See Number Portability Order at Appendix F.

QoR should not delay in any manner the introduction of permanent number portability through the industry accepted LRN method.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Marrero, Esq.

Senior Regulatory Counsel

Teleport Communications Group Inc.

Two Teleport Drive, Suite 300

Staten Island, NY 10311

(718) 355-2939

Its Attorney

L. Fredrik Cederqvist, Esq.
Policy Analyst
Public Policy and Government Affairs

Dated: October 7, 1996

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Josefina C. Barberena, do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Reply to Responses to Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification was sent by first-class, postage pre-paid mail on this 7th day of October, 1996, to the following:

William F. Caton*
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room 222
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Competitive Pricing Division*
Federal Communications Division
Room 518
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Wanda M. Harris**
Competitive Pricing Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Division
Room 518
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

ITS, Inc.*
2100 M Street, N.W.
Suite 140
Washington, D.C. 20037

MCI Telecommunications Corp.
MCI Metro
Loretta J. Garcia
Donald J. Elardo
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

The NYNEX Telephone Companies Campbell L. Ayling 1111 Westchester Avenue White Plains, NY 10604

Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association Wendy C. Chow Michael Altschul Randall S. Coleman 1250 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20036

National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. Perry S. Goldschein Joanne Salvatore Bochis 100 S. Jefferson Road Whippany, NJ 07981

KMC Telecom, Inc.
Andrew D. Lipman
Erin M. Reilly
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W., Ste. 300
Washington, D.C. 20007

American Communications Services, inc. Brad E. Mutschelknaus Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr. Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20036 American Mobile Telecommunications Association, Inc. Jill Lyon Director of Regulatory Relations 1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 250 Washington, D.C. 20036

Nextel Communications, Inc.
Robert S. Foosaner
Lawrence R. Krevor
Laura L. Holloway
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1001
Washington, D.C. 20006

Bell Atlantic John M. Goodman 1133 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

SBC Communications Inc. James D. Ellis Robert M. Lynch David F. Brown 175 E. Houston, Rm 1254 San Antonio, TX 78205

Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems Bruce Beard 17330 Preston Road Suite 100A Dallas, TX 75252

Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. Durward D. Dupre Mary W. Marks One Bell Center Room 3558 St. Louis, MO 63101 GTE Service Corporation
Jeffrey S. Linder
Angela N. Watkins
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

NextLink Communications, L.L.C. Daniel M. Waggoner Richard L. Cys Davis Wright Tremaine 1155 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036

Small Business in Telecommunications, Inc. Dennis C. Brown Brown and Schwaninger 1835 K Street, N.W., Ste. 650 Washington, D.C. 20006

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Co. Thomas E. Taylor 201 E. Fourth Street, 6th Fl. Cincinnati, OH 45202

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Co. Christopher J. Wilson Frost & Jacobs 2500 PNC Center 201 East Fifth Avenue Cincinnati, OH 45202

U.S. Telephone Association
Mary McDermott
Linda Kent
Charles D. Cosson
Keith Townsend
1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005

John Staurulakis, Inc. Michael S. Fox 6315 Seabrook Road Seabrook, MD 20706

OPASTCO Lisa M. Zaina 21 Dupont Circle, N.W. Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036

NTCA
David Cosson
L. Marie Guillory
2626 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

U S West, Inc.
Mark D. Roellig
Dan L. Poole
Jeffrey S. Bork
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

Bell Atlantic NYNEX Mobile, Inc. John T. Scott, III Crowell & Moring LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

AirTouch Communications, Inc. David A. Gross Kathleen Q. Abernathy 1818 N Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20036

AirTouch Communications, Inc. Charles V. Gerkin, Jr. Chorey, Taylor & Feil, P.C. 3399 Peachtree Road, N.E. Suite 1700, The Lenox Building Atlanta, GA 30326

BellSouth Corporation
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
M. Robert Sutherland
Theodore R. Kingsley
Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree Street, N.W.
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Pacific Telesis Group
Pacific Bell, Nevada Bell and
Pacific Bell Mobile Services
Marlin D. ard
Nancy C. Woolf
140 New Montgomery Street
Room 1523, Fifteenth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Alan F. Ciamporcero
Pacific Telesis
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004

Josefina C. Barberena

^{*}Hand Delivery

**Copy on disk